Greetings! Your AARC leadership has been hard at work this year as we work to realize our newly revised mission and vision. We started our year by coming together in Moline, Illinois for an excellent National Assessment and Research Conference, hosted by Dr. Rebecca Newgent and a team of volunteers from Western Illinois University. I was very impressed with the quality of sessions and the many opportunities for student members, emerging professionals, and established scholars to share ideas, encouragement, and opportunities. During our conference, the AARC board approved a proposal for the upcoming 2015 National Conference.

The significance of this conference is that it represents the 50th anniversary of the organization! The 2015 National Assessment and Research Conference will be held September 18-19, 2015 in Memphis, Tennessee; Dr. Stephen Lenz will be chairing the conference. He and his team of volunteers
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The Program Committee for the Association for Assessment and Research in Counseling (AARC) invites members, colleagues, students, and other interested assessment and research specialists to submit proposals for the 2015 National Assessment and Research Conference that will commemorate our 50th anniversary as an organization. We welcome all proposals that advance the counseling profession and that promote best practices in assessment, research, and evaluation in counseling.

Please submit your poster, round table, or content proposal online by visiting the AARC website at aarc-counseling.org. Our submission deadline is May 1, 2015 and program decisions will be made by June 15, 2015. We hope you will be walking in Memphis with us in September!

For more information and to register for the conference, please visit aarc-counseling.org/event-details/19
AARC Call for Awards

Deadline May 20, 2015

Doctoral Exemplary Research and Practice Award

This award goes to a doctoral-level student who has shown a dedication to the mission of AARC through their clinical practice (assessment/ outcome research) or as a researcher leader. Nominees do not have to be AARC members but should have contributed significant levels of service and/or scholarly engagement consistent with the rendering of exemplary assessment or research practices. Members of the Exemplary Practices Awards Committee are not eligible to be nominated during their terms of service. The recipient will be highlighted in NewsNotes and awarded at the AARC annual conference. The recipient will be highlighted on the AARC website and will receive a complimentary one year membership to AARC.

Master’s Exemplary Research and Practice Award

This award goes to a master’s-level counseling student who has shown a dedication to the mission of AARC through their service or scholarly activities (presentations, publications, etc.). Nominees do not have to be AARC members but should have contributed to the counseling field through her or his service and/or scholarly engagement consistent with her or his contribution to exemplary assessment or research practices. Members of the Exemplary Practices Awards Committee are not eligible to be nominated during their terms of service. The recipient will be highlighted in NewsNotes and awarded at the AARC annual conference. The recipient will be highlighted on the AARC website and will receive a complimentary one year membership to AARC.

Submission Instructions for the Master’s and Doctoral Exemplary Research and Practice Award

A vita or resume must be submitted for all nominees. A nomination letter from a faculty member should be submitted along with up to three letters of support. Additional documentation may be provided as evidence to display the student’s level of contribution to research and assessment in counseling. No more than 10 pages of supporting evidence may be submitted. Finally, a one-page statement from the student must be included describing her or his involvement in the profession, research interests, and future goals. All documents should be amalgamated into one .pdf file and submitted to the AARC MAL-Awards chair. Submit applications to: Amanda La Guardia at alagaurdia@shsu.edu.

AARC Donald Hood Student Research Grant

Graduate students who are members of the Association for Assessment and Research in Counseling (AARC) are encouraged to apply for the AARC Donald Hood Student Research Grant. This annual grant program is de- signed to recognize and honor students who are seeking to complete research investigations that show promise for outstanding contributions to the counseling profession. The Student Re- search Grant provides a cash award up to $500.00, a certificate of recognition presented at the AARC Annual Conference and acknowledgement of the award in AARC Newsnotes.

Continued on page 4
AARC Call for Awards - Continued

Deadline May 20, 2015

Submission Instructions for the AARC Donald Hood Student Research Grant

In addition to a resume, cover letter, and faculty letter of support, interested students should submit a 5-page research proposal. The proposal should be written in APA Style with an abstract, introduction, design and methodology, and selected references sections. The proposal should include the following: a) 50-word statement indicating how the project will be helped by the grant; b) 50-word statement discussing the significance of the project; and c) a project budget and timetable for the project’s completion. The title page, table of contents, and references are not included in the page count. If additional space is required to present details of a research instrument or to elaborate on a vital point, an appendix of up to three (3) additional pages may be attached. Studies using any methodological design are encouraged. Please submit four (4) copies of all materials. All documents should be amalgamated into one .pdf file and submitted to the AARC MAL-Awards chair. Submit applications to: Amanda La Guardia at alagaurdia@shsu.edu.

Exemplary Practice Award

This award goes to an individual who has shown a dedication to the mission of AARC through their clinical practice, as an educator, or in another counseling professional role within the community. A program may also be nominated. Nominees should be or consist of AARC members who have contributed significant levels of service and/or publications consistent with the rendering of exemplary assessment or research practices. Members of the Executive Council and the Exemplary Practices Award Committee and their programs are not eligible to be nominated during their terms of service. Recipient(s) will be highlighted in NewsNotes and awarded at the AARC annual conference.

Submission Instructions for the Exemplary Practice Award

Submit a vita or resume for an individual nominated for this award. If a program is being nominated, a nomination letter outlining the program mission, structure, and roles of those involved in the program should be provided. Letters of support need to be included as well as supporting documents to provide evidence for the contribution of the individual or program. One nomination letter and no more than three additional support letters will be accepted. All documents should be amalgamated into one .pdf file and submitted to the AARC MAL-Awards chair. Submit applications to: Amanda La Guardia at alagaurdia@shsu.edu.
AARC President’s Message - continued

have been working hard to ensure a grand and educational time for all as we reflect on 50 years of excellence! Please mark your calendars and consider getting involved.

A number of committees and task forces are hard at work to help us craft products and services that meet your needs and help our profession continue to thrive. The Research Committee, under the guidance of Dr. Christina Peterson, is conducting a series of national needs assessments to guide our long-range plans. The research committee has also been instrumental in developing resources for the members-only features within our new webpage, including a series of demonstration videos that highlight specific assessment approaches relevant to the counseling profession. I have appreciated Dr. Dennis Lin’s continued leadership as our website master as he continues to develop its features (www.aarc-counseling.org). The social media committee, under the leadership of Dr. Rachel Ammons, has crafted a plan to enhance our social presence for meaningful and timely communication with our members. Dr. Carrie Wachter Morris is chairing a workgroup that will collaborate with representatives from key stakeholders to develop a set of best practice standards for child and adolescent assessment.

Dr. Caroline O’Hara has worked tirelessly with the Diversity Committee to develop a set of best practice standards for multicultural research. Finally, Dr. Carl Sheperis has assembled a team of experts to review and revise the Responsible Use and Standards of Testing (RUST) document. We are excited about their work and looking forward to reviewing the end product!

Under the leadership of former editor Dr. Rick Balkin and current editor Dr. Paul Peluso, Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling & Development earned the highest impact factor of any counseling journal. In addition, Dr. Rebecca Newgent has embraced her new role as editor of Counseling Outcome Research & Evaluation. If you are not signed up to receive electronic alerts regarding new journal content, please take a moment to do so today. You can find instructions here.

AARC has much to celebrate this year and many possibilities in the years to come. If you are attending ACA in Orlando, I hope you will join us and get involved with AARC. The AARC Committee and Interest Meeting is open to everyone and will be held on Friday, March 13 from 8:00-9:00am. We will also be enjoying a joint reception with AADA, ACAC, ASERVIC, AHC, and IAAOC on Friday, March 13 from 6:00-8:00pm. Our division will be very well represented at the ACA Awards Ceremony; if you are in town, be sure to come out to support our award recipients on Saturday, March 14 at 6:00pm. Finally, AARC will be hosting six, peer-reviewed sponsored sessions during the conference. Please be on the lookout for AARC-sponsored sessions during your visit.

Finally, I would like to congratulate Dr. Carrie Wachter Morris who begins her term as President on July 1, 2015. I am excited to see how AARC thrives under the leadership of this creative and dynamic team.

As always, I hope you will choose to make your AARC membership meaningful to you. If you would like to get involved or suggest a program, please contact me.

Dr. Shawn Spurgeon
AARC President
Associate Professor
University of Tennessee at Knoxville
Test Review Column:

Personality Assessment Inventory

By Rochelle Cade, University of Mary Hardin-Baylor

**Title:** Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI)

**Acronym:** PAI

**Author:** Leslie C. Morey, PhD

**Publisher:** Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc. (PAR)

**Publication Date:** 1991

**Purpose:** The Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI) is an objective, self-report inventory used to assess adult personality and psychopathology. The PAI provides relevant information for clinicians in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of treatment (Morey, 1996). Morey (2003) suggests the following clinical applications of the PAI: clinical screening, assessment of suicidality, assessment of dangerousness, assessing clinical syndromes, assessment of self-concept, normal personality traits, and treatment planning.

**Population:** Adults, ages 18 and over

**Cost:** A comprehensive kit is available for $315.00. The kit includes the professional manual, 2 reusable item booklets, 2 administration folios, 25 hand-scoring answer sheets, 25 profile forms, and 25 critical item forms. Additional materials (e.g., packages of answer sheets, audio administration CD-ROM) and computer software are available for purchase separately.

**Time:** 50 to 60 minutes

*Continued on page 7*
**PAI Review - continued**

**Scores:** The PAI generates 22 non-overlapping scales (Morey, 1996, 2007). These 22 scales include:

- 4 validity scales:
  - Inconsistency (ICN)
  - Infrequency (INF)
  - Negative Impression (NIM)
  - Positive Impression (PIM)
- 5 treatment consideration scales:
  - Aggression (AGG)
  - Suicidal Ideation (SUI)
  - Stress (STR)
  - Nonsupport (NON)
  - Treatment Rejection (RXR)
- 2 interpersonal scales
  - Dominance (DOM)
  - Warmth (WRM)
- 11 clinical scales:
  - Somatic Complaints (SOM)
  - Anxiety (ANX)
  - Anxiety-Related Disorders (ARD)
  - Depression (DEP), Mania (MAN)
  - Paranoia (PAR)
  - Schizophrenia (SCZ)
  - Borderline Features (BOR)
  - Antisocial Features (ANT)
  - Alcohol Problems (ALC)
  - Drug Problems (DRG)

Ten of the clinical scales have subscales. For example the Mania (MAN) scale has 3 subscales including: Activity Level (MAN-A), Grandiosity (MAN-G), and Irritability (MAN-I).

**Manuals:** The first edition of the manual for the PAI was published in 1991. The 385 page second edition of the professional manual was published in 2007 and is available in both paperback and e-manual versions. The e-manual is available directly from the publisher.

**Administration:** The PAI consists of 344 self-report items that are answered on a 4-point ordinal scale: Totally False (F), Slightly True (ST), Mainly True (MT), and Very True (VT). The PAI can be administered either to groups or to individual clients. The manual specifies that a fourth grade reading level is needed to complete the PAI. The inventory can be taken in a pen and paper format, on the computer, or, for test takers with reading and psychomotor deficits, with an audio CD. A European Spanish version of the PAI is also available. However, it must be scored online through a Spanish-language website. Of note is that this version is normed primarily in Spain.

The manual specifies that the qualifications of examiners administering the PAI include graduate training or coursework in psychodiagnostic assessments. Examiners must also meet Level C qualifications to purchase the PAI materials from PAR.

**Scoring:** The PAI takes approximately 20 minutes to score. Examiners should review the respondent’s answer sheets for missing or unanswered items prior to scoring. The hand-scored answer sheet includes a carbonless two-part form and provides raw scores for each of the PAI scales and subscales. Raw scores on scales and subscales are plotted on a profile and correspond to T-scores. Kavan (1995) notes that some users may find this that calculating the Inconsistency raw score (ICN) challenging because it requires comparing responses to 10
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PAI Review - continued

pairs of items and determining the absolute value of the difference in scores for the 10 pairs of items, and Morey (2003) cautions users to ensure accuracy when calculating this Inconsistency (ICN) raw score. However, computer scoring is available from PAR and examiners can pay a one-time fee for unlimited scoring and interpretation. This option may reduce calculation errors and will likely appeal to users who administer the PAI frequently.

Test Development: The PAI was developed between the years of 1987 and 1991 and is based upon a construct validation framework. Constructs were selected on the basis of two criteria, which Morey (2003, p. 2) cites as “the stability of their importance within the conceptualization and nosology of mental disorder and their significance in a contemporary clinical practice.” Initially, PAI included 2,200 items, but this item pool was reduced to 1,086 following research team ratings, and the pool was further reduced to 776 items after review by an external panel and experts. After administering and analyzing the Alpha version of the PAI, the developers selected 597 items for inclusion in the Beta version. The developers administered the Beta version and analyzed the outcomes, which resulted in the 344 items that currently comprise the PAI.

Sample: The developers of the PAI normed it using a sample of adults from various community settings (n = 1,000), 69 clinical settings (n = 1,246), and 7 university settings, from which college students serves as the norming samples (n = 1,051). The developers selected the norming sample match the 1995 U. S. Census Bureau data for gender, race, and age.

Validity: The PAI manual provides a lengthy and extensive chapter of validity data for the PAI. The manual includes criterion group studies and correlational studies for each of the PAI scales. For example, the PAI scale Depression (DEP) was correlated with a variety of measures, including the Beck Depression Inventory, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-II, Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale, and Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale. Correlational studies are reported using the four PAI validity scales (INC, INF, NIM, PIM) and the L, F, and K scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale.

Reliability: The PAI manual presents internal consistency values for the full scales and subscales for all three samples. Median alpha coefficients for full scales were .81 for the community sample, .82 for the college student sample, and .86 for the clinical sample. Test-retest reliabilities ranged from .31 to .92 with a median of .82. Test-retest for the college sample occurred in a 28 day period; test-retest for the community sample occurred over a 24 day period.

Limitations: Because the PAI is a self-report assessment, the accuracy, memory, self-deception, and impression management of the test taker inherently limits it. Additionally, the test author notes two other limitations (Morey, 2007, p. 7). First, those looking for normative personality constructs, such as the Big Five or Five Factor Model (FFM), might be surprised that the PAI does not include these constructs. Second, the PAI has limited coverage of different clinical syndromes such as eating disorders or dissociative identity disorders (Morey, 2003).

Commentary: The PAI is a self-report inventory that assesses adult personality and psychopathology. Clinicians will most likely appreciate its ease of use, scoring, and interpretation (Kavan, 1995), as well as its comprehensive manual. There are also a variety of supplemental resources available, including a casebook that may be of interest to clinicians and instructors. Clinicians will likely value the PAI’s utility in a variety of clinical applications.

Continued on page 9
PAI Review - continued

and with low reading populations. The PAI also provides support for its psychometric properties from a considerable amount of research with diverse clientele and a multiplicity of settings, and its more recent studies examining the PAI’s function with the fifth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) (e.g. Hopwood, Wright, Krueger, Schade, Markon, & Morey, 2013). White (1996) described the PAI as “an instrument whose psychometric sophistication raises the scientific status of psychological tests” (p. 39). The PAI has been ranked as one of the most frequently used objective personality tests (Piotrowski, 2000) and has been described as an alternative (Boyle, 1995) and worthy competitor (Kavan, 1995) of the Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory-2 (MMPI-2) for both researchers and clinicians.

References


Test Review Column:

Career Factors Inventory (CFI)

By Diane (Dahyun) Tingley, DePaul University

**Title:** Career Factors Inventory (CFI)

**Authors:** Judy M. Chartrand, Steven B. Robbins, Weston H. Morrill, and Kathleen Boggs

**Publisher:** SLS Global, 4501 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 215, Washington DC 20008; Website: www.slsglobal.com

**Forms:** This is the first and only edition of the CFI.

**Groups to Which Are Applicable:** The assessment is suitable for clients ages 13 and older who read at an eighth grade reading level, high school students, college students, returning adult college students, employed individuals planning a second career, and unemployed individuals.

**Languages Available:** English

**Practical Features:** The assessment is self-scored either individually or in group settings and provides three pages of information describing the meaning of each of the scales in the assessment.

**General Type:** The assessment is a measure of career indecision.

**Date of Publication:** 1997

**Cost:** $29.95 for one copy of the assessment.

**Time Required to Administer:** 5 – 10 minutes.

**Purpose and Nature of the Instrument**

**Stated Purpose:** The instrument provides information on how ready a user is to make a career related decision and the

Continued on page 11
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personal-emotional and informational reasons for indecision. Counselors can use this information to create an appropriate career assistance plan.

Description of Test, Items, and Scoring: The instrument is composed of 21-items with questions representing 4 factors of indecision: 1. Need for Career Information (measures the need to gain information about careers before making a career decision), 2. Need for Self-Knowledge (measures the need to gain self-awareness before making a career decision), 3. Career Choice (measures level of anxiety when making a career decision), and 4. Generalized Indecisiveness (measures level of difficulty in making a career decision). Nine items are on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Disagree. Twelve items are on a 5-point semantic differential scale. Total scores are obtained by adding up the responses to the appropriate items. A Score Profile Sheet is provided to allow users to plot the user's percentile based on a college-aged nonclinical sample.

Use in Counseling: The instrument can help counselors differentiate clients in terms of reasons for career indecision and develop specific interventions in a variety of settings such as college orientation, career centers, classrooms, businesses, government agencies, and workshops. The results can be used in colleges to evaluate student adjustment, student retention, institutional planning, and for course planning.

Practical Evaluation

Usefulness of the Manual: The manual is organized into four chapters, which provide the purpose, development, administration, and interpretation of the instrument. The manual is straightforward and Chapter 2 provides information about Reliability and Validity. Chapter 4 of the manual also provides case study examples for individual and group settings. Finally users can make photocopies of the various master sheets the manual provides such as the directions and action plans for a moderate to high score in a certain career factor.

Adequacy of Directions: Directions are provided at the beginning of the assessment along with the purpose of the assessment. The manual provides a master copy of the directions that counselors display on the projector screen while clients fill out the assessment. Counselors or users can add up responses to obtain the total score for each factor.

Normative Sample: The normative sample includes two samples of college students (N = 377 and 405) from general psychology classes at two universities. Students were in their early twenties. These samples were used to determine the percentile in the Career Factors Profile. Scores below or at the mean of the college samples indicated the user needed little or no help with career decisions. Scores slightly above the mean to one standard deviation above the mean indicated the user has moderate difficulty with making career decisions. Scores greater than one standard deviation above the mean indicated the user has high difficulty with making career decisions.

Reliability

Test-Retest: Test-retest reliability was evaluated using both a high school sample over three months and two college samples over two weeks. The coefficients for the college samples for the four subscales (i.e., Need for Career Information, Need for Self Knowledge, Career Choice Anxiety, and Generalized Indecisiveness) ranged from .79 to .91 (Lewis & Savickas, 1995). In another study, the two-week test-retest reliability for college students ranged from .73 to .87 (Chartrand et al., 1990). The coefficients for the high school sample ranged from .57 to .66 (Bizot, 1996).

Internal Consistency: One college sample had a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of .92 for the total score (Lewis & Savickas, 1995).

Continued on page 12
In another college sample, Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was .87 (Chartrand et al., 1990). Another study with a sample of 409 college students from a western university showed an internal consistency of .87 for total CFI (Chartrand et al., 1990).

Validity

Confirmatory Factor Analysis: One study on a community college student sample showed that the independence model (tests hypothesis that all variables are uncorrelated), the 4-factor model, and the one-factor model all did not fit the data (Simon & Tovar, 2004). In Respecified Model 2, item 21 (“Before choosing or entering a particular career area, I need to seek advice from others regarding my choice”) was deleted because item 21 was cross-loaded on Career Choice Anxiety and Generalized Indecisiveness, but the results showed a marginal fit to the data (Simon & Tovar, 2004). In Respecified Model 3, Items 11 (“When I think about actually deciding for sure what I want my career to be, my hands feel” choices: dry/wet) and 12 (“When I think about actually deciding for sure what I want my career to be, my breathing feels” choices: loose/tight) were correlated because Model 2 showed an error covariance between these two items and item 21 was deleted (Simon & Tovar, 2004). Overall, Respecified Model 3 was found to be the best fit and had statistically significant four-factor loadings and variance/covariance parameter estimates (Simon & Tovar, 2004) when compared to the parameter estimates of the original CFI (Chartrand et al., 1990).

Discriminant: One study correlated the CFI with the Ball Aptitude Battery and found that only Need for Career Information was correlated with analytic reasoning (r = .24) (Bizot, 1996). In another study, CFI was correlated with two scales of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, Self-Deceptive Enhancement (SDE – inclination for self-deception, 1-4% shared variance) and Impression Management (IM – inclination to lie about self to others, 2-20% shared variance) (Dickinson & Tokar, 2004). Overall, these two studies show that the CFI has weak correlation with instruments that are not similar to the CFI and therefore CFI has strong discriminant validity.

Convergent Validity: One study showed that the Career Development Inventory and Career Decision Scale were correlated with the subscale, Need for Information (Chartrand & Robbins, 1997). In another study, the Trait Anxiety subscale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory was correlated with Career Choice Anxiety (r = .32) (Chartrand et al., 1990). Overall, the CFI has moderate correlation with similar assessments and therefore shows moderate convergent validity.

Concurrent: In one study with a college student sample, all four of the CFI scales predicted career decision making; three of the scales (Need for Career Information, Career Choice Anxiety, and Generalized Indecisiveness) were able to predict career implementation (Chartrand & Robbins, 1991). Another study showed significant correlation between CFI and Career Choice Status Inventory, another measure of career decision making (Lewis & Savickas, 1995). Overall, these studies show that CFI is related to similar instruments measuring career decision making and therefore, the CFI shows strong concurrent validity.

Evaluation

Cross Cultural Fairness: Two studies have shown gender differences for the Generalized Indecisiveness where women had higher scores than men, but overall did not show gender differences for the total CFI score (Chartrand et al., 1990; Lewis and Savickas, 1995). Studies also did not show ethnic group differences among African American or Black, Non-White Hispanic, and Non-Hispanic White college students.

Continued on page 13
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The mean scores of students from the Chicago/Latino Learning Resource were similar to mean score of other college students (Chartrand & Nutter, 1996). Another study showed that the scores of Non-Hispanic White students were not significantly different from scores of African American or Black students (Cohen, 1994; Perrone, 1994).

Comments of the Reviewer: The instrument has useful applications in career counseling in helping clients determine what factors are hindering them from making career decisions. In addition, the CFI can be used in a variety of settings including universities, businesses, and government agencies. The assessment is easy to self-score and self-interpret. The reliability ranges from acceptable to excellent. Various studies have confirmed the concurrent, discriminant, and convergent validity of the instrument. The test manual provides next steps and resources for users that have moderate to high scores for each factor. Overall, I recommend the use of the Career Factors Inventory for clients who are the beginning their career search or looking to switch careers.
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AARC Newsnotes

Call for Submissions

If you have any information related to the activities of AARC members that you think should be highlighted, we want to hear from you! Please submit a Microsoft Word file with a writing style that is consistent with the APA 6th edition style.

Student Perspectives Section

Submissions should highlight issues related to the process of research proposal development; topics related to research design, dissertation writing, and presentation of research; perspectives on assessment use among counselors, particularly related to training and professional development in using assessment measures; experiences with finding funding support and writing small grants; as well as locating and participating in professional development activities related to the AARC mission. Submissions should range between 500-800 words and clearly indicate a student-based perspective on the topic featured. Feel free to contact Caroline O’Hara with questions.

Test Review Section

Submissions should highlight an assessment instrument that would be useful to counselors or counselor educators. Submissions should range between 2 to 4 pages. Feel free to contact Jeffrey Sullivan with questions.